

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
6

7 RANDOLPH L. MOORE,

8 Petitioner,

9 v.

10 WILLIAM REUBART, *et al.*,

11 Respondents.
12

Case No. 2:13-cv-0655-JCM-DJA

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
(ECF NO. 156)

13
14 In this capital habeas corpus action, after a 120-day initial period, and extensions
15 of time of 62, 30, 30, 60, 62 and 60 days, the respondents were due to file an answer by
16 June 10, 2022. See Order entered April 12, 2021 (ECF No. 143) (120 days for answer);
17 Order entered August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 145) (62-day extension); Order entered
18 November 1, 2021 (ECF No. 147) (30-day extension); Order entered November 8, 2021
19 (ECF No. 149) (30-day extension); Order entered December 16, 2021 (ECF No. 151)
20 (60-day extension); Order entered March 1, 2022 (ECF No. 153) (62-day extension);
21 Order entered April 8, 2022 (ECF No. 155) (60-day extension).

22 On June 8, 2022, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF
23 No. 156), requesting a further 90-day extension of time, to September 8, 2022. This
24 would be the seventh extension of time, after an initial period of 120 days. After about
25 16 months total as of now, Respondents are asking for the longest extension of time
26 yet. Respondents' counsel states (as in all the previous motions for extension of time)
27 that he needs this extension of time because of his obligations in other cases.
28 Respondents' counsel states: "Barring unforeseen circumstances, this will be Counsel's


1 last request for an enlargement of time in this matter.” Motion for Extension of Time
2 (ECF No. 156), p. 4. Respondents’ counsel states that the capital habeas petitioner in
3 this case takes no position with respect to this motion for extension of time. The Court
4 will grant Respondents’ motion for extension of time. However, *the Court will not look*
5 *favorably upon any motion to further extend this deadline.*

6 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Respondents’ Motion for Extension of
7 Time (ECF No. 156) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until and including
8 **September 8, 2022**, to file their answer.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Petitioner will have 120 days to file a reply to
10 Respondents’ answer; in all other respects, the schedule for further proceedings set
11 forth in the February 5, 2019, scheduling order (ECF No. 51), will remain in effect.

12 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
13 25(d), William Reubart is substituted for William Gittere as the respondent warden. The
14 Clerk of the Court is directed to update the docket to reflect this change.

15
16 DATED June 13, 2022.

17
18 
19 JAMES C. MAHAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28